DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 362 SO 011 059

AUTHOR Tangri, Sandra S.; Strasburg, Georgia L.
TITLE Can Research on Women Be More Effective in Shaping Policy?
PUB DATE 27 Aug 77
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (San Francisco, California, August 27, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Civil Rights Legislation; Decision Making; Disadvantaged Groups; Discriminatory Legislation; Economic Disadvantagement; *Females; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Legislation; Legislators; Literature Reviews; *Policy Formation; Political Influences; Psychology; Quality of Life; *Relationship; *Research Needs; Social Change; Social Influences; Socially Disadvantaged; *Social Planning; *Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

In order to formulate social policy which is responsive to needs of women and other minority groups, decision makers must be better informed about alternative options, incentives, and unintended as well as intended consequences of various policies. Social scientists can contribute to decision makers' understandings of social factors in numerous ways. They can call attention to policy-relevant questions, provide impact analyses, and conduct evaluation research. Institutional mechanisms for producing the most useful research about women and minorities must be devised through cooperative efforts of government agencies, research organizations, and interest groups. Also, graduate programs in psychology and related social sciences should train students to conceptualize, understand, and investigate public policy issues. Problem areas in which research on women could have a significant impact include community response to physical, aesthetic, and service needs; welfare policies; occupational choice and affirmative action; and situational determinants of sex-typed traits. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164362

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter C. Katz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Can Research on Women Be More Effective in Shaping Policy?

by

Sandra S. Tangri
Georgia L. Strasburg
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

SO 011 059

Can Research on Women Be More Effective in Shaping Policy? *

19

Sandra S. Tangri
Georgia L. Strasburg
U. S. Commission on Civil Rights

Introduction

Many of us are interested in making social policy more responsive to equity concerns, particularly those of women and minorities. Social policy at its best is the informed choice of alternative options, based on comparisons in terms of costs and benefits, and effect on incentives (Rivlin, 1971). From our point of view, the costs and benefits are both psychological and economic, social and individual. We would like to know who will benefit, who will be harmed, and to what extent. We would like to know what unintended as well as intended consequences can be foreseen, and if necessary, avoided or provided for. We would like to know, in particular, how policies and programs or the lack of these, affect women and minorities. But to know this, and to have this knowledge influence development of equity policy, it is not sufficient to conduct research on women and minorities, or any other disadvantaged group. Most academic research on these topics finds its way into dissertations, journals, professional meetings, and occasionally books. It rarely contributes to the decision-making process on issues of importance to us: affirmative action, childcare, educational equity, job desegregation, etc. It is easy to feel that the researcher's product is the most rational input that policy-makers can have. But policy-making is not a rational, scientific process for the most part. It is a political process, and we would like to suggest how research can play a role in it.

SD01029

---

* Invited address for Division on the Psychology of Women at the 85th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in San Francisco, August 27, 1977. The views expressed in this paper should not be attributed to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Special thanks to Lenora McMillan for her expert assistance in our legal research, and to the Office of Research staff, Gregg Jackson, Miriam Kelty, Martha Mednick, Jo Freeman, Charles Mosher, and Bernice Sandler for their comments on an earlier draft.

CN000-172
2/24/78

Although we recognize that there are valid arguments against as well as for social scientists' participation in policy making, we proceed on the assumption that there is more to be gained than lost. A succinct summary of the arguments against such a role has been assembled by Carol Weiss (1977, p.2) as follows:

1. Policy oriented social science research diverts social scientists from their true priority of enlarging knowledge;
2. By accepting government funding, social scientists must give advice prematurely on the basis of inadequate knowledge thus bringing the disciplines into disrepute and benefitting neither government nor the social sciences;
3. Letting government officials define their research problems distorts the development of the disciplines: only areas of interest to government are advanced while issues salient to the theoretical core of the discipline are neglected;
4. Social scientists who not only address the research problems that officials set but who address these problems on their terms and with their value orientations abdicate their role as scientists and become technicians for the powers-that-be; and finally,
5. When social scientists serve the needs of any government in power--whatever its political stripe--they become political handmaidens of the state instead of the independent critics they should be.

There is finally, the suspicion that whatever impact our research may have it is so small relative to the play of other forces, so uncertain as to occurrence, and so unpredictable as to political application, that the ultimate justification may simply be that we do it because we enjoy it, and we would enjoy it even more were it to contribute to achieving a more equitable society.

But in fact, studies show that social science research is used by policy-makers, both in direct instrumental ways, and in more diffuse conceptual ways which enlarge policymakers' understanding of social complexities. (Weiss, 1977)

Toward enhancing this end, we are suggesting 1) how we could make our research more useful to policy-makers, 2) some institutional mechanisms which the profession could adopt, 3) a variety of roles and settings for the conduct and application of such research, and 4) upcoming problem areas in which research could have a significant impact.

How to Make Research on the Psychology of Women More Useful

Although many researchers resist having their choice or method of research dictated by considerations other than scientific merit and their own curiosity, many are also interested in seeing certain social changes take place and may even assume that their own research should play a role in such changes. The reasons for this not happening very often have been discussed by many authors (Crain, 1976; Special Commission on the Social Sciences of the National Science Board, 1969, Komarovsky, 1975 (especially the article by Merton); Cohen and Weiss, 1977; and Caplan, 1975). Lipman-Blumen (1974) and Tangri (1976) discuss such issues specifically in the context of sex role and sex difference research. These reasons cover a wide range of obstacles including the complex and tentative nature of academic research, the trained incapacities of academic researchers to shift their focus and to respond in a timely manner, differences in value orientations between researchers and the potential users of the research, the lack of practical recommendations, the lack of professional incentives for doing policy-relevant as opposed to theoretical research, the existence of competing research findings and interpretations, and the fact that

each discipline brings its own pet methodologies and research focus to bear so that the resulting findings are difficult to integrate. All of these undermine the authority which research might bring to bear on an issue. On the other side of the coin, there may be no institution appropriate to take up relevant research findings and act upon them; or the implications of the findings may threaten the status quo; or may require politically infeasible resources. Furthermore, as the research questions become more refined and as policies develop around the initial issues, the definition of what the social problem is that needs to be addressed begins to shift. (Cohen & Weiss,1977)

Since there is ample discussion on why academic research is not useful to policy-makers, we will focus on how it can be.

Janet Weiss (1976) has differentiated three kinds of "usefulness" that research can have for affecting social policy. One is the "intrinsic" usefulness of studies which are persuasive because they address policy relevant questions and meet high standards of clarity, consistency, comprehensibility, and technical quality, have findings which are statistically and socially significant and convergent with those of similar studies, and they suggest alternatives for action which are consistent with the data. Meeting these criteria would maximize the persuasiveness of the research. These standards or criteria are, of course, not new to us and we accept most of them as readily as we do the concepts that we learned in our first statistics course. Note, however, two of these criteria which we do not usually apply to our choice and conduct of research: that it address policy relevant questions and that it suggest alternatives for action. Typically, the recommendation at the conclusion of a study is that more research is needed. Nonetheless we think most of us

would not be adverse to addressing policy relevant questions more directly and suggesting alternatives for action. This seems reasonably consonant with our intuitive sense that research on the Psychology of Women is--or should be--"relevant".

A second kind of "usefulness" is what Weiss calls "intellectual" usefulness, that is, research which affects the climate of belief by changing society's understanding of its own functioning. This occurs for instance, when research provides a new conceptual framework for looking at social phenomena. Her example is radical behaviorism; we would add the feminist critique. Another kind of intellectual usefulness creates a shift in focus by interpreting old information in a new light, for example, by redefining problems as non-problems (e.g., working mothers and "latchkey" children; or homosexuality), or non-problems as problems (e.g., the standard work week; the standard school day and functions; the old boy network). Or it is research which challenges a social myth about the dynamics of a problem by offering a more accurate understanding about how social institutions work. Good examples in our area of interest are Kate Millett's Sexual Politics (1969), Phyllis Chesler's Women and Madness (1972), and Adrienne Rich's Of Woman Born (1976).

Weiss argues that "Social science research which changes social beliefs can have dramatic, although indirect, effects on the policy process" (p. 237) and that "since intellectual usefulness may be the most interesting and, in the long run, most productive way in which social research is useful to government" that we should not neglect it in favor of the other two. This is hard to argue with, and no doubt each of us would like at least once in our lifetime to make a contribution of new concepts, focus, or framework that makes that kind of difference.

But, if you like to take long shots, let us suggest here her third kind of "useful" research, which is "political" usefulness. The factors which make research politically useful are: being available when needed (i.e., the timing is right); communicating what was done, what was found, and what it means in language policy-makers can understand; focusing on variables which policy-makers can do something about; producing findings which suggest action alternatives which are politically and financially feasible; having the researcher perceived as objective by the policy-maker; and having the scope of the conclusions be appropriate to the scope of decisions which can be made about the subject (i.e., for instance, advocating sweeping social changes ignores the incrementalism of policy-making; just as it ignores the fact that most research is also incremental). Other researchers include the extent to which the findings conform to the policy maker's own views as another important predictor of a study's political usefulness (Carol Weiss and Bucuvalas, 1977) Meeting such criteria will maximize the chances that some policy-maker will introduce the research in some form into the political debate. Please note the modest objective. Even meeting all these criteria (which is seldom possible in any one piece of research), is not considered likely by itself to change the opinion of any policy-maker.

Also note that there are contradictions between some of the criteria for the three kinds of usefulness. To be persuasive, research should produce findings which are convergent with similar research, whereas to be intellectually useful, research may well present conclusions quite divergent from accepted wisdom or the "state of the art". Politically useful research should produce conclusions whose scope is practicable, whereas intellectually useful research may produce quite radical and sweeping conclusions. This suggests that it is probably not possible to serve all of these functions simultaneously.

Two types of research are now in vogue and make fair bid to being the most important kinds of policy-relevant research around. Evaluation research, which tries to measure the extent to which an ongoing program is achieving its objectives, can be used for fiscal oversight purposes, or for analytical purpose to make corrections which will better achieve a program's objective. Thus one might want to evaluate Women's Studies Programs to determine to what extent it enhances women's motivation to stay in school, or to do well; whether it creates an active, successful coterie of research scholars, whether it meets the intellectual and social support needs of women students, or reduces instances of sexist bias in classroom teaching -- or whatever the original objectives were conceived to be. Evaluation has its own host of methodological and interpretive problems, and discussions of these can be found in Rivlin (1971), and Tavris (1976), etc.

The other type of research is impact analysis which is prospective rather than post-hoc: it is an attempt to anticipate the outcomes, both intended and unintended, of policy decisions or programs prior to enactment. Pilot testing may be one methodology for this purpose, other approaches are in the nature of forecasting from models or simpler regression equations. Thus one might research the probable impact of terminating Medicaid funding for abortions on 1) illegitimate births; 2) teenage pregnancy; 3) births in different segments of the population; 4) illegal abortions; 5) maternal mortality rates; 6) child abuse; 7) female employment; or 8) welfare programs, etc. Or one might research the impact of trends in workforce participation by mothers on 1) need for child care; 2) maternal health and welfare including poverty levels; 3) child health and welfare; 4) divorce rates, etc.

Note that these examples begin with a "problem" or program or anticipation of a problem. This is one basic difference between policy-oriented research and academically oriented research. Most academic research begins with a theory, concepts or models and the quest is for theoretical progress, not solving social problems. However, it is possible to find policy implications in some of the typical academic research on Psychology of Women, although beginning with a conceptual variable tends to leave the applicability more problematic. A classic example is the research on Motive to Avoid Success.

The initial reception to this research was a terrific "aha!" experience, a sense of subjective identification with a phenomenon which rang true. The policy implications, though never spelled out, seemed to suggest that recognition of this double-bind that potentially successful women confront would change the climate of opinion and make it more sympathetic to achieving women. Another implication (also not spelled out), was that sex roles and the socialization for them that created the motive were, after all, only human creations and could be changed.

However, the later reaction was more negative in terms of political and policy implications, suggesting that such research tended to place the blame for women's non-achievement on themselves with the implication that women had to change rather than social institutions. Much subsequent work with this variable tended to fuel this reaction because it used Fear of Success as an independent variable to predict various achievement-related or counter-achievement outcomes. Although necessary to establish the measure's validity, this work needed to move on to other conceptual tasks.

A different research strategy could have made fear of success (FOS) the dependent variable resulting from various social and institutional arrangements. The policy implications that could be drawn from this research might have dealt with ways to re-arrange such settings in order to minimize development of Motive to Avoid Success and its effects. In recent issues of the Psychology of Women Quarterly devoted to achievement motivation, and of Sex Roles devoted to FOS research, together totaling 16 articles, not one mentions the possible significance of the research for any social policy. We believe a larger sample of articles would reveal the same thing. That, of course, is not unusual for an academic journal. Both of these issues are excellent examples of the incremental nature of social science. None of the articles attempt a fundamental redefinition or shift in how we think about our society. In Weiss' terms they are neither "intellectually useful", nor "politically useful", nor even "intrinsically useful" for affecting social policy since they fail to address policy relevant questions or suggest alternatives for action. Either such articles are seldom submitted to these journals or editorial policies screen them out. Certainly "applied research" does not enjoy the same status as basic research. Thus, the next section deals with institutional (rather than individual) mechanisms for increasing the probability that psychological research will contribute to social policy.

II. Institutional Mechanisms

There are two issues in doing "politically useful" research which most differentiate it from academic research. One is the choice of research questions, the other is the dissemination of research findings. In the first case, although most researchers are resistant to advice on their research agenda, it is very clear that the present collective agenda in academic research on women's issues is surprisingly removed from policy concerns. Yet, we do want to move beyond

talking to ourselves in our own esoteric but comfortable world, and to use our research expertise to address the issues that concern women in a way that policy-makers will listen to but without binding ourselves to their research agenda.

Secondly, once a "useful" piece of research is done, it must be disseminated beyond the academic journals and in a form that makes sense to this "new" audience. This can be done by an individual researcher in the capacity of an informed citizen, as a part of a professional organization with an "educational" or a lobbying arm, or as an expert providing testimony or consultation to policy-makers. It can also be done by having the research published in periodicals more likely to be read by policy-makers. Some of these roles require very little time, e.g., a phone call to your representative. In the next section of this paper we describe a number of possible roles and settings for this purpose. For those of us who feel that we cannot possibly take on one more role in our already crowded and overcommitted lives, a model for an ongoing relationship between activists and researchers developed by the Federation of Organizations for Professional Women is very attractive as it addresses the question of bridging the gap between research and policy without converting researchers to activists (or vice versa). In Effecting Social Change for Women (1976) they write:

> "We began...with the erroneous notion that improved dissemination of relevant research results was a key...to utilizing knowledge to effect desired change. We learned...that it is not sufficient to disseminate research findings. Dissemination and understanding do not necessarily result in action. What became apparent is that it is not just a matter of translating research into action, but rather it is essential to plan and design the research with specific goals of social change in mind." (Brown, et. al., 1976, p. 27)

Recognizing that there are differences in "concepts, priorities, timing, approach, assumptions, and starting points" between activists and researchers, they propose that an ongoing exchange between them is essential to produce the needed research, and to keep up with the constantly changing "goals, research, and action strategies required to reach the goals". (p. 31) The model consists of eight action stages beginning with identification of desired social change and call for collective action, through assignment of responsibilities, strategy development sessions, implementation of research and of action agendas, dissemination of results, and identification of new or modified goals.

The term activist here refers to persons whose field of action is influencing policy-making. The role of the activists in this process is to contribute their knowledge of what needs to be done and their understanding of what has been attempted in the past. This perspective helps the researchers consider their research priorities and the possible policy implications of their research.

The role of the researchers is to contribute knowledge of completed and ongoing studies relevant to the targeted problem; to help the activists frame their questions in research terms; and to develop research designs which incorporate mechanisms for ongoing evaluation. New questions need to be asked, new paradigms are needed, and doing this may take the researcher outside her original field. We suggest that a consortium of research and interest groups seek long-term funding to institutionalize this model to provide the lead-time and interaction necessary to produce the most policy useful research possible. The Association for the Advancement of Psychology might be an appropriate vehicle for the development of such a proposal.

Other arenas where the psychology profession can institutionalize mechanisms for increasing the usefulness of research for policy purposes are in training, internships, editorial policies, convention agendas, and the "educational" or lobbying activities of the American Psychological Association.

The obvious innovations in the area of training is the development of graduate programs which train psychologists to "conceptualize, understand, and investigate a public policy issue in its psychological dimensions and to translate that analysis and research into terms and information that a 'consumer' of such knowledge could readily understand and act upon". (Brayfield & Lipsey, 1975) Brayfield and Lipsey reported in 1975 that such programs had been established at Michigan State University, Pennsylvania State University, the Wright Institute, and Claremont Graduate School. To date, we can add to this list the joint Ph.D in Psychology and J.D. in Law Programs at Stanford University, Northwestern University, and the University of Nebraska. Similarly, very successful Applied Sociology Programs or specialties exist at Columbia University, Boston University, University of Chicago, University of California, Santa Cruz, University of Pittsburgh, and other places. Such developments should serve to raise the status and legitimacy of research for policy use. Whether the cause of greater equity will also be served and how vulnerable the programs will be to the political pressures engendered by the very fact of being relevant, has yet to be seen.

Even outside these specialized programs doctoral programs in psychology can incorporate a criterion of policy usefulness into the existing panoply of standards by which dissertations and term papers, for example, are evaluated. Such a standard would not supplant existing criteria but supplement them, so that students would be encouraged to consider the possible policy impacts their work could have in an area of interest to them.

Internships are another device by which researchers can get to know how the policy process works and what kinds of research may be useful. The American Psychological Association supports one intern a year to work in Congress on policy matters pertinent to APA. The American Political Science Association's Congressional Fellowship Program includes 40 to 50 Fellows each year, some of whom are supported through affiliate arrangements. The size and focus of the APA program should be increased. Instead of focussing exclusively on issues affecting the profession, it should place a high priority on equity issues for the society as a whole.

Another professional institution which can either inhibit or nurture the development of policy-related research is the exercise of editorial policy in professional journals. At present, most psychology journals, especially the more prestigious ones, pursue an editorial policy which, if not discriminatory in intent toward policy useful research, certainly appears to be discriminatory in effect. The standard academic criteria of research excellence creates a press toward purer and cleaner isolation of variables, a tone of detached value-free expression, and derivation of research questions from theoretical constructs rather than real life problems. All of these operate, even if inadvertently, against even the "intellectually useful" research which tends to challenge the accepted paradigms in a given field of investigation. Such research is considered difficult to judge by the established criteria in the field. Furthermore, feminist scholarship and other scholarship from minority points of view, often challenge vested interests that editors have in the intellectual domain and in the economic domain of the profession. A fuller analysis of these issues is provided by Laws (1977).

But of the three kinds of policy "useful" research, the least hospitality in academic publications is offered to "politically useful" research. Perhaps this is no great loss, since policy makers are not likely to read these publications in any case. Some journals do specialize in publishing applied research, but articles about equity issues tend to get buried in the gamut of other field-related concerns (e.g., in education, industrial psychology, etc.).

Although we could argue that this points to the need for yet another vehicle for the publication of equity research, this is not the recommendation we favor, for two reasons. One is that the profession as a whole would assign low status to such a journal and it would therefore be difficult to sustain a strong flow of good manuscripts for consideration; nor would the work appearing there earn the brownie points it deserves. Secondly, although it would be convenient as a resource for that small band of researchers publishing in it, the impact certainly on the rest of the profession, and probably on potential users in policy-making positions may be quite small.

For the second audience, the one we are most interested in for the present purposes, direct personal contact by activists within the model proposed earlier seems the most effective. Most people in Washington worth their salt are deluged with reading matter anyway.

Finally, with respect to Convention programming, the major problem in getting a hearing is that acceptance/rejection decisions are based on such ambiguous or sparse information about any given paper, workshop, roundtable, or symposium, that undue weight must often fall on the reputation of the presenter, or the "trendiness" of the subject matter. However, the great (and increasing) variety of formats, plus some attention from the press, make this a much better forum

for discussing policy-relevant research than the journals. In this light it is interesting to note the experience of Paul Lazarsfeld in organizing the American Sociological Association's Annual Convention in 1962 around the theme of the uses of sociology. He found most papers were on the sociology of law, of medicine, and of business. (Lazarsfeld & Jaeckel, 1975)

Our lesson from that experience is "Be Prepared". It is not enough to declare a Convention theme, you must have prior and shared definitions of what that theme means so that people are in fact offering the analyses you'd like to hear about. Yet, other hazards occur also. A lesson even closer to home is last year's experience with SPSSI's theme for APA which was "Law, Legislation, and Human Behavior".

Although one of the hottest legal issues around is affirmative action, not a single paper or symposium in SPSSI's program dealt with it despite the fact that a proposal for a symposium on the subject had been submitted.

It is important to note that the recommendations being made here are intended to supplement, not replace existing practices. These recommendations are intended to expand, not narrow, the variety of research we do, and what we do with it. Furthermore, there are opportunities for psychologists and other social scientists to play a larger role in many settings within the Federal policy structure. The next section describes what some of these opportunities are. Although this discussion focusses on the Federal level, policy is made at many levels. If you are interested in influencing the city council, the parole board, or high school principal, you need to identify the possible entry points at which research can make a contribution, to know when it is needed, and to adapt the research to the users' need.

III. Roles and Settings for Social Scientists in the Federal Policy Structure

It has been estimated that almost one-fifth of the psychologists in this country are employed in federal, state, or local units of government, filling roles in service, research, and administration (Brayfield & Lipsey, 1975). Appendix A is a resource list of divisions or units in Executive Branch agencies and departments which fund or carry out research on women or issues of concern to women, and units in the other two branches (legislative and judicial) that use policy-relevant social science research.

We would have liked to, but cannot, provide an analysis of the relative impact of each kind of research, introduced via each kind of role, on each setting. The task of predicting or measuring the extent of impact of a given piece of research is extremely difficult, and is not attempted here. As Weiss put it so eloquently:

> "Concepts, generalizations, data, perspectives are absorbed from an array of sources, unreferenced and uncatalogued, and they make their way wraithlike, but sometimes with surprising power, into the emerging decision." (C. Weiss, 1977, p.11)

This brief overview of possible roles to be played by psychologists in various settings is only suggestive and not intended to be comprehensive.

Executive Branch. In the Executive Branch, for example, the executive departments (such as Health, Education, and Welfare) are major users of social science through intramural research functions and program initiatives. More than half of the research and development of the nation is financed by the federal government and 70% of this work is through agency contracts and grants to the private sector (National Science Foundation, 1977).

A good example of an executive agency's use of social science research is the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor which has contributed heavily to the formulation of policies affecting women. Established in June 1920, the Women's Bureau's concise, in-house secondary research documenting the legal and economic status of women has been used consistently in Congressional hearings. In the published hearings preceeding passage of Title IX,[1/] research conducted by the Women's Bureau constituted the largest single source of data documenting the effects of discrimination against women, and certainly made a significant and powerful contribution to the hearings.

Another channel for funneling research on women into the Executive Branch is through White House personal staff and special counsels and consultants to the President. For example, in February 1973 the Office of Women's Programs was established within the White House, and was the first direct advisory office to the President for women's issues. At the present time, the Carter administration has abolished the Office of Women's Program's and established the Office of Public Liaison which is now headed by Midge Costanza. One of its units is an office for the special concerns of women and minorities headed by Jan Peterson. This office is now undertaking an in-house research effort to document discrimination against poor working women, as well as using outside research to document their position papers.

A third advisory channel in the Executive department is the network of outside consultants tapped by the White House to serve on permanent and temporary

1/ Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrmination in educational institutions receiving federal money.

advisory commissions. The exact extent of influence of these commissions, ad hoc groups, and task forces is varied, however interviews with Congresspersons and senior members of the bureaucracy reveal that more and more policy emanates from these White House collectivities (Cronin & Greenberg, 1969). For example, President Kennedy established the President's Commission on the Status of Women in 1961, at the behest of Esther Peterson, then Director of the Women's Bureau. Its 1963 report, American Women, documented how thoroughly women were denied equal opportunity. Although the report did not lead immediately to concrete legislation, state commissions on women were established in response to its recommendations. These commissions are still in existence and continue to utilize social scientists and social science in their in-house research efforts. Another such group was the Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women (CACSW) headed by Catherine East, a sociologist, which helped draft Executive Order 11375 (which extends the President's affirmative action plan to include remedies for sex discrimination). During the Nixon Administration, Vera Glaser and Catherine East helped create the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities which was chaired by Virginia Allan. The Task Force's Report in April 1970, A Matter of Simple Justice, used descriptive research to document sex discrimination in the political, economic, and social spheres. The National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, created by President Ford in 1975, has conducted large scale in-house research efforts as well as utilizing the services of other government research bodies. In addition, extramural research has been contracted out extensively.2/

The fourth advisory channel in the Executive Branch is the White House support staff. This includes, for instance, the Office of Management and the Budget,

2/ For example, "Legal Status of Homemakers" by Edith R. Conlin (n.d.)

the Council of Economic Advisors, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), and the Civil Service Commission, among others. Each of these offices employs social scientists and has research capabilities, and social scientists are often used as part-time consultants. In recent years over 200 scientists and engineers have served as part-time consultants to OSTP alone (Cronin & Greenberg, 1969).

Legislative Branch. There are four Congressional support agencies which are the major investigative tools for the Legislative branch of government. They are the Congressional Research Service (CRS) of the Library of Congress, the Government Accounting Office (GAO), the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). All of them employ social scientists.

The CRS and the GAO are the primary research arms of Congress, and are funded by legislative appropriations. Their services range from supplying specific information to an individual Congressperson, to carrying out sustained analyses for oversight, appropriations or authorization programs. They have a combined annual budget of approximately $186 million and employ 6,600 persons. In conjunction with the research and information activities customarily performed by the CRS staff, the Service is attempting to identify emerging policy issues and establish continuous liaison with congressional committees.

The Government Accounting Office (GAO), has specific authority to review programs for Congress. As of 1971 it also has increased responsibilities to assist Congress in its oversight functions. Thus, although either House of Congress or Committee may request a program analysis by GAO, the research conducted at GAO is more likely to be done for committees.

The Office of Technology Assessment's basic function is to provide congressional committees with assessments which identify a broad range of intended and

unintended consequences, social as well as physical, which will accompany the uses of technology. Their budget provides for approximately 6.5 million dollars of intra-and extramural research, of which half is allocated to research relating to the social aspects of technology.

The Congressional Budget Office gives Congress an overview of the Federal Budget and weighs the priorities for national resource allocation. According to Charles Mosher (1977) former Representative from Ohio, this office will play an increasingly important role in Congress. Its present Director is Alice Rivlin, an economist who has written extensively about the role of social science in policy-making (Rivlin, 1971).

Other internal sources of information are the professional staffs of the members of the committees, of individual congresspersons and student interns and policy fellows. The staff has the capacity for great influence on Congressional decision making. They often control the flow of communication to the office and the Congressperson, and staff expertise and judgment is expected on a wide range of activities and critical variables (Hammond, 1973).

As early as 1946 the Legislative Reorganization Act recognized the need for increased professionalization and specialization among committee and personal staffs, and a trend toward social science experts has been clearly expressed since that time. For example, in 1972, Dr. Bernice Sandler, a psychologist, was hired as "educational specialist" to Representative Edith Green's staff, and her contacts with academic women and familiarity with social science findings contributed significantly to the passage of major legislation affecting women's education.

Temporary staff members, such as Interns and Fellows can also have significant impact. A feminist political scientist on Senator William Brock's staff provided the inspiration for the equal credit opportunity title which was proposed by Brock as an amendment to the Fair Credit Billing Act and was eventually adopted into legislation (Freeman, 1975).

In addition to these formal internal structures there are several informal groups of Members of Congress which meet regularly to discuss their common interests and new information bearing on these (e.g., the Democratic Study Group, Wednesday Night Group, and the newly formed Women's Caucus, co-chaired by Margaret Heckler and Elizabeth Holtzman).

Aside from the internal ability of Congress through structural and individual processes to obtain social science information, a number of significant external sources are utilized extensively, including assistance by the executive departments, private consultants and contracts, professionals who testify before legislative and oversight committee hearings, lobbyists and constituents. Each of these provide opportunities for social scientists to play a role. Even as a private citizen you may request time to testify at a hearing, or have your Representative insert your research findings into the Congressional Record. According to Charles Mosher, the greatest influence can be brought to bear on a Representative or Senator by an informed and responsible constituent from her or his own district or State.

Judicial Branch. In the Judicial Branch the Federal Judicial Center was established to further the development and adoption of improved judicial administration in the courts. To do this, it is mandated to conduct research on the operation of the courts and to stimulate and coordinate such research on the part of other public and private persons and agencies.

But beyond this, the increasing use of social science in judicial proceedings has so dramatically altered the traditional practice of exclusive reliance on argument based on precedent, that it has given rise to a new field called "sociological jurisprudence".

DeTocqueville, in one of his insightful remarks about the American system, concluded that "scarcely any political question arises in the United States that is not resolved sooner or later into a judicial question". (Bradley, 1961, p. 290) Still, the courts are not traditionally viewed as active policymaking bodies, but rather as "interpreters of the law". While it is true that the courts are essentially "reactive" (in that an individual citizen or class of citizens must bring his/her complaint before the bench before the Courts can act), "reactive" is not to be construed as "passive". This distinction is most dramatically drawn by the alternative interpretations of the Constitution as a literal, inflexible document or as an adaptive and dynamic legal tool.

The shift of the Supreme Court in the twentieth century from its longstanding focus on property rights to civil rights under Earl Warren leaves no doubt that the meaning of the Constitution changes or is clarified to a large extent in accord with the value preferences of the justices as they respond to the varied political, economic, and social moods and problems of the time. (Rosen, 1972)

These complex political, economic, and social problems have aroused debate within the judicial system as to whether the Constitution can be interpreted strictly by nomological means or whether, as Felix Frankfurter asserted "the

types of cases now calling for decision to a considerable extent require investigation of voluminous literature, far beyond the law reports and other legal writings". (Frankfurter, 1957)

The need for "extralegal" information in the judicial process has come to be known as sociological jurisprudence. Proponents of this approach claim that the court's "decisions cannot rest alone on syllogism, metaphysics, or some ill-defined notion of natural justice, although each will play its part". (White, 1972) They assert that law is ultimately concerned with social behavior, and research on the social implications of legal decisions could and has made an appropriate and needed contribution. Obvious examples are in the Roe v Wade abortion decision, and in school desegregation cases going as far back as Brown v Board of Education. Nevertheless, the use of "extra-legal" facts in court decisions is a recent and disputed development in the jurisprudence process. The increased use of sociological information can be attributed primarily to Louis Brandeis. The "Brandeis Brief" has come to mean a "source of information or vehicle that has been used to bring social science findings to the attention of the Court". (Rosen, 1972, p. 201)

The Supreme Court's formal recognition of the "Brandeis Brief" came in 1908 in the Muller v Oregon case. Many consider this to be the case that tilted the balance in the traditional tension between social science and the law. In fact, the recognition of this brief using social science data was perhaps only due to the "great presence and persuasive pleading of Louis Brandeis himself". (Rosen, 1972) Because Muller v Oregon is a landmark case, and because the social science findings represented "research on women," Muller v Oregon is a particularly interesting case for feminist social scientists.

In 1905 Curt Muller, the proprietor of the Grand Laundry in Portland, Oregon was convicted of violating a state statute specifying that "no female can be employed in a mechanical establishment, factory or laundry more than ten hours during any one day". (Rosen, 1972, p. 77) This case was popularly referred to as "The Case of the Overworked Laundress". Muller brought the case to the Supreme Court and drew a formidable opponent: Louis D. Brandeis represented the state of Oregon.

Brandeis recognized that radical social welfare measures required an equally radical defense before the Court. Brandeis therefore asked his sister-in-law, Josephine Goldmark, to gather "facts" published by experts in the field with respect to labor and women. A research staff of ten under the direction of Ms. Goldmark was formed, and a radical kind of brief was drawn up. Over one hundred reports by physicians, economists, factory inspectors, and sundry bureaus of statistics comprised the bulk of the brief. In fact "only two of the briefs' 113 pages" resembled the traditional forms of advocacy. (Rosen, 1972, p. 78)

Brandeis' extralegal sources were used to substantiate four specific hypotheses: (1) that women are physiologically different from men and are more susceptible to injury resulting from unregulated industrial conditions; (2) that excessive hours of labor generally endanger the health, safety, and morals of women; (3) that shorter workdays for women produce economic benefits for the employer; and (4) that shorter workdays foster individual health and improve homelife. For these reasons, he argued, the Court should uphold Oregon's limitation of working hours for women. Brandeis persuaded the court that his massive collection of facts was relevant to the process of judicial interpretation, and he received a decision in his favor.

While the Brandeis brief in Muller v Oregon set an historically important precedent in jurispurdence, it also raises some of the problem and fears associated with the use of social science in the courts. The studies cited in the brief were used to argue for a policy which, though liberal for its time because it protected women from some harsh aspects of industrial employment, is considered by most feminists today to be conservative, discriminatory, and undesirable. Thus, because the value context has sufficiently changed, the studies might be interpreted today so as to support a quite different judicial decision, e.g., that if those hours of work are harmful to women they are probably also harmful to men, and everybody's hours should be shorter. Alternatively, the studies themselves might be challenged, as much on methodogical grounds as on the basis of new values.

A second concern has to do with the validity and reliability of the studies' findings and whether different findings would support different judicial decisions. Or, as others might say, whether the interpretation of the Constitution can rest on the shifting sands of social science. David Cohen and Janet Weiss (1977) have explicated how the inherently tentative nature of social science findings on school desegregation (as well as of other matters) has affected court decisions beginning with the Brown v Board of Education decision and Kenneth Clark's research on Black children. The danger in this trend is that, as Morroe Berger said, "we may reach a point where we shall be entitled to equality under the law only when we can show that inequality has been or would be harmful". (1957)

These issues, combined with the wide gaps in the literature, and the inappropriateness of the adversary system for discovery of truth (Wolfe, 1976) tend to make for some apprehension about the growing use of social research findings in the courts, particularly in the Supreme Court.

As in other arenas of policy-making, social science cannot ultimately answer value questions. Essentially, the court is always faced with the task of weighing and choosing values. The courts cannot ask social science, for example, whether equal job opportunity is more valuable than family stability. But social science can help to explain the etiology of social behavior, the effects of the law on social behavior, and the probable consequences of legal decisions and how values and goals can best be realized. (Rosen, 1972)

With these tasks in mind, social research could make a contribution to the development of affirmative action policy in the courts and other pressing social issues. Most civil rights suits rest their positions on the 14th Amendment's guarantee to "equal protection and due process under the law". But, as Douglas conceded, "the conditions of what constitutes equal treatment for the purpose of the Equal Protection Clause do change". (Justice Douglas , 1966) Justice Harlan called for social science's help in "understanding fact situations that might suggest the need for new conceptions of what constitutes due process and equal protection under the laws". (Rosen, 1972, p. 223) The next section suggests some policy areas in which research on women could have significant impact.

IV. Important Issues During the Next Five Years

Research has the greatest potential for impact when new issues first come to public attention (Sandler, 1977). When debate on an issue first begins, research can help set the terms of discussion, define the boundaries and

seriousness of a problem, steer the search for causal factors, and increase the number of policy or action options being considered. It can put an issue into historical and cross-cultural perspective. Psychological research, in particular, can bring into focus the meaning of a problem or impact of a policy on the individual, the family, or other social group or institution. Research can also play a role before and during the drafting of legislation; and before, during and after the hearing process. But by the time legislation is in markup (finalizing the wording of the bill, working out compromises between the Senate and House versions, and between various interest groups), it is too late for research to play a role--the process then is purely political. A good example now is the abortion issue in which the terms of debate are by now almost entirely ideological or value-laden. Therefore, in this last section of the paper we would like to offer some suggestions about the "hot issues" coming up for policy treatment on which research could be very timely.

For policy-relevant research to be "politically" or "intrinsically" useful it is necessary for the policy issues to be up front in conceptualizing the research question, in designing the methodology, and in analyzing and interpreting the data. This is not true of "intellectually" useful research. As an illustration of these differences let's examine the subject of female solidarity.

There has been a growing interest in female solidarity as an historical phenomenon and one that alters and greatly enriches our view of both American history and the possibilities of sisterhood. Such investigations serve an intellectually useful function by opening up for comparison the interpersonal conditions under which, say 18th Century women carried on their roles and responsibilities. Our social network and interpersonal resources appear rather impoverished compared to the faithfulness with which women of those times took

care of each other, both within and across household boundaries. Historical study reveals how the move to the Western frontier weakened and largely distroyed that resource that women provided each other, (Bernard, in press) and we can see it has for the most part not been replaced.

But as yet, the policy implications of this research are not obvious. The policy contribution so far is "intellectually useful" because it brings to awareness a problem--paucity of interpersonal support--which was not previously available to us.

What research questions would increase the "intrinsic usefulness" of this area of inquiry for policy purposes? In addition to all the quality criteria that can be met, two elements are needed: targeting the policy issue, and suggesting alternatives for action. One of the policy areas for which this research is relevant is the need for community structures which serve their members' needs for physical safety, for aesthetic surroundings, for exchange of minor and major services, and for reliability of service delivery from outside the community. Research could be designed to investigate what support systems are necessary to enable a community to provide for these kinds of needs; to delineate the varieties of such support systems; and to identify the antecedents necessary to sustaining such systems, such as, for example, female solidarity. Demographic studies might reveal that females are not only the more omnipresent members of a community than men, but perhaps also the most durable. Policies built around strengthening the external support systems for these members might succeed in improving the quality of community life where others haven't. Thus, implications might be derived for a number of issues percolating their way toward re-evaluation, such as, the disparate treatment of women in social security and

pension plans, the welfare mess, pregnancy as an allowable disability in benefit plans, and the growing need for child care. These are some of the hot issues on which useful research can have significant impact.

Furthermore, research on the relation between female solidarity and community support systems could explicate mechanisms for helping women to cope with the political structure either by making more effective demands on it, or by entering it to achieve their own goals, many of which are for home and community improvement.

Research targeted this way would capitalize on the current trend to seek more decentralized and small-scale solutions to social problems, to enhance the pluralistic pride in local identities, and to strengthen the family in whatever contours it appears.

To go one step further, such research would be "politically useful" for policy if it focusses on variables accessible to policy-makers (e.g., welfare payments), and suggests action alternatives which are politically and financially feasible and of a scope appropriate to the decisions which can be made (e.g., relocating the authority for determining the allocation and conditions of welfare payments). Finally the research would have to be communicated in language policymakers can understand.

Try a few exercizes of this kind with your favorite research topic, be it occupational choice, sexuality, life cycles, personality theory, the structure of the family, affective education, or situational determinants of sex-typed traits. You may find that the search for policy implications and the translation of empirical data into real life terms and actionable recommendations surprisingly interesting.

The challenge to be useful is a different one from doing clever, careful, theory-derived research. Trying to meet it may even alienate you from your colleagues. It is less likely to have weight in a tenure decision. It is tainted by being timely (therefore assumed to be "quick and dirty"). And if your research is done in the capacity of a federal employee, as ours is, you are likely to be accused of having been co-opted. On the other hand, there is the possibility that it will be cited in Congress, presented in testimony, influence the shape of legal guidelines or--as happened with some work we did not long ago--become part of the conversation between a Commissioner and the President.

References

Bernard, J. "Models for the Relationship Between the World of Women and the World of Men." In Social Conflict, Social Movements, and Social Change, L. Kriesman (ed.), in press.

Bernard, J. Women and the Public Interest. New York, N.Y.: Aldine-Atherton, Inc. 1971

Berger, R.L. "Desegregation, Law, and Social Science", Commentary, 1957, 23, 471-475

Brayfield, A.H. & Lipsey, M.W. "Public Affairs Psychology." Invited address at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, N.Y., January 30, 1975.

Brown, J.S. Lear J. , & Shavilik, D.L. Effecting Social Change for Women, Wash., D.C.: Federation of Organizations for Professional Women, Oct. 1976

Brown v Board of Education 347 US 483, 74 S. CT 686, 98L Ed. 873 (1954)

Caplan, N., Morrison, A., and Stambaugh, R. The Use of Social Science in Policy Decisions at the National Level. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, 1975.

Chesler, P. Women and Madness. New York, New York Avon Books 1969

Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Women in 1975. Washington, D.C. 1976

Cohen, D.K. and Weiss, J.A. "Social Science and Social Policy: School and Race". In Using Social Research in Public Policy Making, C.H. Weiss (ed.), Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 67-83.

Commission on the Operation of the Senate. Toward a Modern Senate, Washington, D.C., 1976 (Modern Senate)

Conlin, R. "Legal Status of Homemakers Study", (n.d.)

Crain, R.L. "Why Academic Research Fails to Be Useful", School Review, May 1976, 337-351.

Cronin, T.E. and Greenberg, S.E. The Presidential Advisory System, New York N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1969.

de Tocqueville, A. Democracy in America, P. Bradley (ed.), New York, N.Y.: Vintage Books, 1961.

Douglas, W.O. 1966: Harper v Virginia State Board of Elections, 383 U.S. 663, 667 (1966). dissenting opinion

Frankfurter, F. 1957: Ferguson v Moore-McCormack Line, 352 U.S. 521 (1957) dissenting opinion

Freeman, J. The Politics of Women's Liberation. New York, N.Y.: David McKay, Inc. 1975.

Green, M. Who Runs Congress?, New York, N.Y.: Bantam Books, 1975.

Hammond, S. "Personal Staff of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives," Unpublished dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1973

Horowitz, D.L. The Courts and Social Policy. Washington, D.C. The Brookings Institution, 1977.

Kahn, L. The Dynamics of Scapegoating: The Expulsion of Evil. Unpublished paper, 1977

Kanter, R.M. Social Science Frontiers. New York, N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation, 1977

Komarovsky, M. Sociology and Public Policy: The Case of Presidential Commissions. New York, N.Y.: American Elsevier, 1975.

Konefsky, S.J. The Legacy of Holmes and Brandeis: New York, N.Y.: Collier Books, 1961.

Laws, J.L. "Patriarchy as Paradigm: The Challenge from Feminist Scholarship." Paper presented at the Feminist and the Scholar IV Conference at Barnard College, N.Y.C., April 23, 1977.

Lazarsfeld, P.F. and Jaeckel, M. "The Uses of Sociology by Presidential Commission" In Sociology and Public Policy: The Case of Presidential Commissions, M.Komarovsky (ed.), N.Y., N.Y.,: American Elsevier, 1975, Ch.5.

Lipman-Blumen, J. "The Dialectic Between Social Policy and Research". Kwynote Address, WEAL Conference, Dec. 1974

Longaker, R.P. The Presidency and Individual Liberties. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1961

Millet, K. Sexual Politics. New York, N.Y.: Avon Books, 1969.

Mosher, C. Interview on May 18, 1977.

Muller v Oregon 208 U.J. 412 28 S. Ct 324, 52 L. Ed. 551

National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year. To Form a More Perfect Union. Washington, D.C. 1976

National Science Foundation (NSF). National Patterns of Research & Development Resources (prelim. report) Wash., D.C., 1977

Orenstein, N. "Information, Resources and Legislative Decision-Making: Some Comparative Perspectives On..." Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972.

President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities. A Matter of Simple Justice. Washington, D.C. 1970

Redman, E. The Dance of Legislation. New York, N.Y.: Simon and Schuster, 1973

Rich, A. Of Woman Born New York, N.Y.: W.W. Norton and Co., 1976

Rivlin, A. Systematic Thinking for Social Action. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1971.

Roe Wade 410 U.S. 113 93 S. Ct, 756, 35L. Ed. 2nd 147 (1973)

Rosen, P.L. The Supreme Court and Social Science. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1972

Sandler, B. Interview on May 28, 1977.

Special Commission on the Social Sciences of the National Sciences Board, NSF. Knowledge Into Action, Improving the Nation's Use of the Social Science, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of The House of Representatives. Discrimination Against Women, Sec 805 of 160098, Washington, D.C., 1971

Tangri, S. "Using Sex Role Research to Guide Public Policy" Paper presented at Russell Sage College Conference on Sex Roles in American Society, May 1976.

Tavris, C. "Compensatory Education. The Glass is Half Full", Psychology Today, Sept. 1976, 63-74

Weiss, C.H. and Bucuvalas. "The Challenge of Social Research to Decision Making" Using Social Research in Public Policy Making, C.H. Weiss, (ed.), Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1977

Weiss, J. "Using social science for social policy." Policy Studies Journal, Spring, 1976, 1976, Vol. 4, No. 3 234-238

White, B. 1972: Miranda v. Arizona 384 US 436 (1966) dissenting opinion

Wofe, E.P. "Social Science and the Courts: The Detroit Schools Case." In Social Science and Social Policy, C. Weiss (ed.), Winter 1976, No. 42, 102-120

Can Research on Women Be More Effective in Shaping Policy*

A Resource List of Offices Using Social Science Research, Organized by the Branches Of Government

CONTENTS:

I. Executive** p.1
   A. White House Support Offices p.1
   B. Agencies p.2
      I.Divisions, Offices, Programs (which support research on women)
   C. Commissions p.3
      1.Divisions, Offices,Programs (which support research on women)
   D. Departments p.3
      1.Divisions, Offices, Programs (which support research on women)
II. Legislative p.12
   A. Support Offices
   B. Standing Committees p.12
      1.House
      2.Senate
III. Judicial p.13
IV. Women's Lobbies p.14

I. EXECUTIVE

A. Office of Management and Budget
Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20500
202-395-3000

Office of Science and Technology
Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20500
202-395-7116 Contact: Frank Press (Director)

Office of Public Liaison
Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20500
202-456-6585 Contact: Midge Costanza (Assistant to the President)

Associate Director for Women's Affairs
202-456-6620 Contact: Jan Peterson

*Invited Address for Division on the Psychology of Women at the 85th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, August 27, 1977
By: Sandra S. Tangri and Georgia L. Strasburg

**Thanks to the Ford Foundation for the use of parts of this section

B. AGENCIES

ACTION
806 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20525

1. Office of Policy and Planning
202-254-6860 Contact: Mary DeCarlo

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & SPACE ADMINISTRATION
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20546

1. Office of Procurement
202-755-2270 Contact: Stanley Sawmelle

1. Office of University Affairs
202-755-0946 Contact: Doris Goodwin

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
806 15th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20506

1. Grants Office
202-634-4216 Contact: William Potter or John Wooster (Chief)

1. Program Development Office
202-382-8333 Contact: Valarie Peacock

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
1800 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20550

1. Directorate for Research Applications
202-632-5820 Contact: Darlene Morano

1. Division of Exploratory Research
202-632-7420 Contact: Lynn Preston (Deputy Director)

1. Women in Science Program
202-282-7150 Contact: Joan Callanan

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
1441 L Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20416

1. Advocacy Office
202-653-6580 Contact: Barbara Dunn

C. COMMISSIONS

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION
1121 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20425

Office of Research
1. 202-254-5674 Sandra Tangri (Director)

1. Women's Rights Program Unit, Office of the Staff Director
202-254-8127 Contact: Carol Bonosaro (Director)

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
1900 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20415

1. Governmentwide Federal Women's Program
202-632-7082 Contact: Diane Herrmann (Acting Director)

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
2401 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

Office of Public Affairs
1. 202-634-6930 Contact: Jean Hundley

D. DEPARTMENTS

AGRICULTURE
14th & Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington. D.C 20250

Cooperative State Research Service
1. 202-417-6033 Contact: Mary Roach Higgins or Paul Jellick

Equal Employment Office
1. 202-447-3263 Contact: Marjorie Holt

4-H Youth-Extension Service
1. 202-447-4784 Contact: Hope Daugherty

Home Economics Extension Service
1. 202-447-6059 Contact: Ava Rodgers

D. DEPARTMENTS (Cont.)

Agricultural Research Service
1. Federal Building
6505 Bellcrest Road
Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

Consumer and Food Economics Institute
202- 436-8461 Contact: Frances Magrabi

Research Agreements and Patents Management Branch
202-436-8403 Contact: Wayne Thrush (Chief)

COMMERCE
14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20230

Economic Development Administration
1. 202-377-2127 Contact: Joan Sheehy

Office of Minority Business Enterprise
202-377-3816 Contact: Sherman Funk or Constance King

DEFENSE
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C.

Office of the Secretary
1. 202-695-2431 Contact: Jeanne Randall

Office of the Assistant Secretary
202-695-5133 Contact: Lucille Dion

Office of Defense Research and Engineering
202-697-4789 Contact: James Terrell

Army Research Institute
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209
202 694-4040 Contact: Nora Kinser or J.E. Uhlaner
Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
202-274-6867 Contact: Fuller Murfree

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

D. DEPARTMENTS (cont.)

1. Under Secretary
Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women
202-245-8454 Contact: Sandra Kramer

Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management
Federal Women's Program, HEW
202-245-6634 Contact: Florence Perman(Director)

Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
Office of Special Concerns
202-245-6102 Contact: B.Ann Kleindeinst

Women's Action Program
202-245-6622 Contact: Phyllis Belford or Connie Downey

1. Education Division
Assistant Secretary for Education
200 Insdependence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201
202-245-8974 Contact: Elizabeth Payer

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-245-9806 Contact: Alison Bernstein

National Center for Education Statistics
400 Maryland Avenue S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-472-5123 Contact: Iris Garfield

National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Education Equity Group

Women's Research Program
202-254-5406 Contact: Jean Lipman-Blumen(Director

Education and Work
202-254-5470 Contact: Mary Lou Randour

Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

D. DEPARTMENTS (cont.)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE (cont.)

Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education
1. 202-245-7904 Contact: William Pierce

Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-245-7857 Contact: George Rhodes

Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-245-8176

Bureau of Postsecondary Education
7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-245-9870 Contact: Nell Jackson

Office of Career Education
7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-245-2331 Contact: Terry Newell

Women's Program Staff (WEAA)
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Rm 3125
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-245-2181 Contact: Joan Duval (Director)
Mary Jane Smalley

Office of Human Development

Administration on Aging
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Division of Research and Analysis
202-245-0006 Contact: Frances Jacobs

Office of Child Development
400 6th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20213

Children's Bureau
202-755-0587 Contact: Arlene Taylor

Public Health Service

Assistant Secretary for Health
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857

D. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE (cont)

1. Office of Administrative Management

Division of Grants and Contracts
202-443-6630 Contact : Tom Shoe (Director)

Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health
Administration
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857

National Institute on Drug Abuse
Program for Womens Concerns
Office of N.I.D.A.
11400 Rockville Pike Rm. 814
Rockville Md. 20852
202-443-3693 Contact: Jody Forman-Sher (Act. Dir.)

Scientific Project Analysis and Retrieval System
202 443-3376 Contact: Ruth Kay

National Institute of Mental Health
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Md. 20857

Social Sciences
202-443-3936

D. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE (cont.)

1. National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20852
202-443-1910 Contact: Elizabeth Kutzsky

Center for Disease Control
Atlanta, Georgia 30333

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857

Grants Administration and Review Board
202-443-4493 Contact: Benjamin Bruckner (Chief)

Procurement and Grants Management
202-443-3122 Contact: Leo Sanders (Chief)

Public Health Service (cont.)
Health Resources Administration
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Office of Health Rsources Opportunity
201-443-2153 Contact: Maggie Matthews

Health Services Administration
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857

Office of Family Planning
202-443-2430 Contact: Ernest Patterson

National Institutes of Health
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Division of Contracts and Grants
202-496-4422 Carl Fretts (Director)

Office of Extramural Research
202-496-1357 Contact: Anne Koffman

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development

Center for Population Research
202-496-1174 Contact: Wendy Baldwin

D. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE (cont.)

Center for Research for Mothers and
Children
202-496-5575

Social Security Administration
6401 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, Maryland 21835

Office of Research and Statistics
301-594-0474 Contact: Henry Brehm (Chief)

Office of Research and Statistics
1875 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202)-673-5787 Contact: Lucy Mallan

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
451 7th.. S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20410

1. Office of Consumer Affairs
and Regulatory Functions
202-755-6524 Contact: Joyce Skinner

Office of Policy Development and
Research
202-755-5421 Contact: Susan Jaffee

Program Standards Division
202-755-7010 Contact: Mary Pinkard

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
9th & Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Contracts and Procurment
202-737-8200 Contact: John Goodwin

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531

Office of Regional Operations
202-376-3944 Contact: Marlene Beckman (Chairperson)

Profile Office
202-376-3886 Contact: Jean Goodloe

D. DEPARTMENTS (cont.)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
200 Constitution Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C 20210

1. Employment Standards Administration

Women's Bureau
202-523-6602 Contact: Curtis Gilroy

Mary Hilton (Deputy Director)
202-523-6612

Employment and Training Administration
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20213

Office of Comprehensive Employment Development

Jobs Corps
202-374-6995 Contact: John Stetson

Work Incentive Program (WIN)
202-376-6512 Contact: Suzanne Parrish

Office of National Programs
202-376-7242 Contact: Gail Gibson or Robert McConnon(Dir.

Office of Policy Evaluation and Research

Office of Research and Development
202-376-7335 Contact: Robert Manifold or Howard Rosen(Di

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
201 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20520

International Women's Year Commission
1. 24th & E Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20520
202-632-8888 Contact: Mildred Marcy or Catherine East

Agency for International Development
21st & Virginia Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523
202-632-7976 Contact: Daniel Parker(Administrator)

Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
202-632-3224 Contact: Pauline Hooper (Deputy Director)

Women and Development
202-632-8576 Contact: Nan Frederick (Act.Director)

Educational and Cultural Affairs
202-632-2958 Contact: Mariada Bourgin
202-235-1040 Contact: Pauline Hooper

Departments (cont.)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

Office for Civil Rights
202-426-4648 Contact: Wanda Reyna

Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20591

Office for Civil Rights
202-426-3785 Contact: Louisa Stimpert

Federal Highway Administration
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

Office of Contracts and Procurement
202-755-9370 Contact: H.G. Gale

II. LEGISLATIVE

U.S. Congress Information
202-224-3121

A. General Accounting Office
441 G Street, NW
Washington, D.C.
2020-275-6202 Contact: Charles Magnetti (Personnel Director)
Roland Sawyer (Information Officer)

Congressional Research Service
Library of Congress
10 First Street SE
Washington, D.C. 20540
202-426-5000 Contact: Norman Beckman (Acting Director)

Office of Technology Assessment
119 D Street NE
Washington, D.C. 20510
202-224-8711 Contact: J. Dicken Kirschten (Public Affairs Officer)

Congressional Budget Officer
Second and D Streets SW
Washington, D.C. 20515
202-225-1491 Contact: Alice Rivlin (Director)

B. Standing Committees of Congress

House

Agriculture 225-2171
Appropriations 225-2771
Armed Services 225-4151
Banking, Currency, Housing 225-4247
Budget 225-7200
District of Columbia 225-4457
Education and Labor 225-4527
Government Operations 225-5051
House Administration 225-2060
Interior and Insular Affairs 225-6065
International Relations 225-5021
Interstate and Foreign Commerce 225-2927
Judiciary 225-7709
Merchant Marine and Fisheries 225-4047
Post Office and Civil Service 225-4054
Public Works and Trasnportation 225-4472
Rules 225-9486
Science and Technology 225-6371
Small Business 225-5821
Standards of Official Conduct 225-7103
Veteran's Affairs 225-3527
Ways and Means 225-3625

Senate

Agriculture and Forestry 224-2035
Appropriations 224-3471
Armed Services 224-2127
Banking, Housing, Urban Affairs 224-7391
Budget 224-0642
Commerce, Science and Transportation 224-511
Finance 224-4515
Foreign Relations 224-4615

12

Standing Committees of Congress (cont.)

Senate — Area Code (202)

224-4751
Government Operations 224-4751
Judiciary 224-5225
Labor and Public Welfare 225-4527

Public Works 224-6176
Rules and Administration 224-0000
Veteran's Affairs 224-9126
Energy and Natural Resources 224-4971

III. JUDICIAL

Federal Judicial Center
Dolly Madison House
1520 H Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-393-1640 Contact: Sue Welsh (Information Specialist)
Walter Hoffman (Director)
William Eldridge (Director of Research)

IV. WOMEN'S LOBBIES

National Women's Political Caucus
1411 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C.
202-347-4456 Contact: Fredi Wechsler

National Organization for Women
425 13th Street, NW
Washington, D.C.
202-347-2279

Women's Lobby
201 Mass. Ave. NE
Washington, D.C.
202-547-0044 Contact: Carol Burris (President)

Other Sources of Federal Funding Information:

Smithsonian Scientific Information Exchange
Room 300
1730 M Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-381-4211 Contact: Ann Reardon